

BROWN, VENCE & ASSOCIATES




Review of Animal Waste Management Regulations

Task 4 Report: Evaluation of Alternative
Confined Animal Facilities Criteria to Protect
Groundwater Quality From Releases

San Jose State University Foundation

Final Report | November 2004



This document was prepared through an agreement with the San Jose State University Foundation (Account Number 22-1509-3083) under the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Standard Agreement Number 01-281-150-0. Funds used relating to the preparation of this report were \$111,897.36.

Statement of Preparation

This final *Task Four Report: Evaluation of Alternative Confined Animal Facilities Criteria to Protect Groundwater Quality From Releases* was prepared by Brown, Vence & Associates (BVA) for the San Jose State University Foundation under Contract Account No. 22-1509-3083 under the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Standard Agreement Number 01-281-150-0. Principal authors of this study were:

Representing BVA:


Tim Raibley, PE

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tim Raibley". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a solid horizontal line.

PE 35322

Representing RMC Geoscience:

Richard A. Mitchell, CEG

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Richard A. Mitchell". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a solid horizontal line.

CEG 1371

Final Report | November 2004



Review of Animal Waste Management Regulations

Task 4 Report: Evaluation of Alternative Confined Animal Facilities
Criteria to Protect Groundwater Quality From Releases

San Jose State University Foundation

Presented to | **San Jose State University Foundation**
P.O. Box 720130
San Jose, CA 95172-0130

Presented by | **Brown, Vence & Associates**
198 Cirby Way, Suite 170
Roseville, CA 95678

Table of Contents

Section 1 Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose and Scope of Evaluation	3
1.1.1 Purpose of Investigation.....	3
1.1.2 Approach and Scope.....	4
1.2 Report Organization	4
Section 2 Factors Affecting Groundwater Quality	7
2.1 Groundwater Risk Factors.....	7
2.1.1 Waste Toxicity and Concentration.....	8
2.1.2 Input Loading	11
2.1.2.1 Anaerobic Lagoons.....	11
2.1.2.2 Corral/Feedlot Areas	12
2.1.3 Aquifer Vulnerability	13
2.2 Numerical Modeling.....	13
2.3 Implications	15
Section 3 Performance Goals	17
3.1 Antidegradation Policy Requirements	17
3.2 Specified Performance Goals.....	17
3.2.1 No Release to Underlying Geologic Material	18
3.2.2 No Change in Groundwater Quality	19
3.2.3 No Exceedances of Water Quality Objectives	19
3.2.4 Application of Goals to Current Evaluation.....	21
Section 4 Identification of Alternative Minimum Criteria.....	23
4.1 Site Characterization	23
4.2 Alternative 1	25
4.2.1 Siting	25
4.2.2 Design (Containment System)	25
4.2.3 Construction Quality Assurance.....	26
4.2.4 Operations and Maintenance	27
4.2.5 Monitoring	27

Table of Contents

4.2.6 Closure	27
4.3 Alternative 2	28
4.3.1 Siting	28
4.3.2 Design (Containment System)	29
4.3.3 Construction Quality Assurance	30
4.3.4 Operations and Maintenance	30
4.3.5 Monitoring	30
4.3.6 Closure	30
4.4 Alternative 3	31
4.4.1 Siting	31
4.4.2 Design (Containment System)	31
4.4.3 Construction Quality Assurance	33
4.4.4 Operations and Maintenance	33
4.4.5 Monitoring	33
4.4.6 Closure	34
Section 5 Financial Evaluation of Alternatives	57
5.1 Cost Assumptions for Alternatives	57
5.1.1 Alternative 1 Costs	59
5.1.2 Alternative 2 Costs	60
5.1.3 Alternative 3 Costs	60
5.2 Total Cost of Alternatives	64
5.3 Available Funding Sources	65
5.3.1 Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP)	65
5.3.1.1 California County EQIP Program	65
5.3.2 Clean Water State Revolving Fund	67
5.3.3 Dairy Waste Management Loan Program	67
5.3.4 Proposition 50	67
Section 6 Recommendations	69
6.1 Recommended Minimum Criteria	69
6.1.1 Preconstruction	69

Table of Contents

6.1.2 Siting	69
6.1.3 Design	70
6.1.3.1 Retention Ponds	70
6.1.3.2 Corrals	70
6.1.3.3 Milk Parlor	70
6.1.4 Construction	70
6.1.5 Operations	71
6.1.6 Maintenance	71
6.1.7 Monitoring	71
6.1.8 Closure	71
6.2 Approach to Implement Minimum Criteria	71
References	73

Appendix A - Numerical Modeling

Appendix B - Financial Evaluation of Alternatives

Tables

Table 1-1 Comparison of Different State Regulations Regarding Maximum Allowable Seepage Rate and Distance to Groundwater for Large Scale Animal Waste Lagoons	3
Table 2-1 Summary of Principal Factors That Must Be Considered When Assessing Potential Effects of Confined Animal Facility Wastes on Groundwater Quality	8
Table 2-2 Chemical and Physical Characteristics of Waste From Anaerobic Lagoons Used to Contain Animal Waste	9
Table 2-3 Summary of Saturated Paste Chemistry of Samples From the Surface of Active Feedlot Pen Surfaces	10
Table 2-4 Summary Of Dairy Waste Characterization Milking Centers	10
Table 4-1 Summary of Minimum Site Characterization Requirements for Confined Animal Facility Design and Permitting	24
Table 4-2 Summary of Alternative 1 Minimum Criteria And BPTC to Approach a No Release to Underlying Geologic Materials Performance Goal	35

Table of Contents

Table 4-3 Summary of Alternative 2 Minimum Criteria and BPTC to Approach A No Change In Groundwater Quality Performance Goal	44
Table 4-4 Summary of Alternative 3 Minimum Criteria and BPTC to Approach A No Exceedances of Water Quality Objectives Performance Goal.....	50
Table 5-1 Well Installation Costs.....	58
Table 5-2 Laboratory Testing Costs.....	59
Table 5-3 Summary of Costs for Alternative 1	61
Table 5-4 Summary of Costs for Alternative 2	62
Table 5-5 Summary of Costs for Alternative 3	63
Table 5-6 Summary of Net Present Value.....	64
Table 5-7 Counties in the Central Valley Region with Specific Confined Animal Facility Opportunities	66